Solving the EPR paradox: an explicit statistical model for the singlet quantum state

David H. Oaknin*
Rafael Ltd, IL-31021 Haifa, Israel

The strong experimental evidence for the violation of Bell's inequalities is widely interpreted as the ultimate proof of the impossibility to describe Bell's polarization states of two entangled particles in terms of a local and realistic statistical model of hidden variables in which the observers are free to choose the settings of their measurements. In this paper we note, however, that Bell's theorem relies crucially on a fourth implicit theoretical assumption, in addition to the explicit hypotheses of locality, physical realism and 'free will'. Namely, we note that the proof of Bell's inequalities for generic models of hidden variables implicitly assumes that there exists an absolute reference frame of angular coordinates, with respect to which we can define the polarization properties of the hidden configurations of the pair of particles. This implicit additional assumption, however, is not required by any fundamental physical principle and, indeed, it may be incorrect if the hidden configuration of the pair of entangled particles breaks the rotational symmetry along an otherwise arbitrary direction. We explicitly show that by giving up to this additional implicit assumption it is possible to build a local and realistic model of hidden variables for Bell's polarization states, which complies with the demands of 'free-will' and fully reproduces the quantum mechanical predictions. The model presented here offers a new insight into the notion of quantum entanglement and the role of measurements in the dynamics of quantum systems. It may help also to develop new tools for performing numerical simulations of quantum systems.

arXiv:1411.5704v8 [quant-ph] 29 Sep 2016

1. The inability to complete with a model of hidden variables the description of physical systems provided by the quantum mechanical wavefunction lies at the core of a long lasting debate about the foundations of the quantum theory and the role played by measurements. The debate started in the 30's with the formulation of the renowned Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen (EPR) paradox [1] and the realization that the standard quantum formalism cannot integrate two fundamental physical principles usually taken for granted, namely, the principles of locality and physical realism. Since the early 60's the debate has focused around some fundamental mathematical theorems which show that the quantum mechanical theoretical predictions for the statistical correlations between certain sets of physical observables cannot be reproduced within the framework of generic classes of models of hidden variables that share common intuitive features [2–9].

The best known among these theorems is Bell's theorem [2], which establishes constraints (Bell's inequalities) on the correlations that can exist within the framework of these generic models of hidden variables between the spin polarizations of two causally separated particles tested along any two arbitrary directions, when they are required to be fully anti-correlated along any two parallel directions [10] and the two observers are assumed to be able to choose freely the setting of their measurements [11]. Bell's inequalities allow to experimentally distinguish between the predictions of quantum mechanics, which do violate them, and those of these generic models of hidden variables, which are constrained to comply with them.

Indeed, many carefully designed experiments performed during the last thirty years have consistently confirmed the violation of Bell's inequalities according to the predictions of quantum mechanics [12–20] and, thus, have ruled out all these generic models of hidden variables. These results have been confirmed very recently by the last and the most precise of the experimental tests performed to date by closing the loopholes of previous tests [21].

The strong experimental evidence for the violation of Bell's inequalities is widely interpreted (see, for example, [22]) as a definitive proof of the impossibility to describe Bell's polarization states of two entangled particles with a local and realistic model of hidden variables, in the terms envisioned by Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen in their foundational paper [1].

In this paper we note, however, that Bell's theorem relies crucially on a fourth implicit theoretical assumption, in addition to the aforementioned hypotheses of locality, physical realism and the 'free-will' of the observers to choose the setting of their measurements. We explicitly show that models of hidden variables that do not comply with this additional assumption are not constrained by Bell's inequalities and, hence, they cannot be ruled out by the experimental evidence. Indeed, we build an explicit model of hidden variables that fully reproduces the predictions of quantum mechanics.

In order to formulate this additional assumption we must first make a couple of important observations:

First, we notice that each one of the two measuring apparatus in a Bell experiment has a built-in preferred direction, with respect to which it measures the relative orientation of the hidden configurations of the pair of particles. These relative orientations are described with the help of two angular coordinates $\omega_A \in [-\pi, \pi)$ and $\omega'_B \in [-\pi, \pi)$. A statistical model of hidden configurations should specify how these two coordinates are related to each other for each experimental setting, and also how the binary outcomes, either $+1$ or -1, of each one of the

measurement apparatus are related to these coordinates. Locality demands that the binary outcomes that a hidden configuration produces in each one of the two measuring apparatus are given, respectively, by $S(\omega_A)$ and $S(\omega'_B)$, where $S(\cdot)$ is the apparatus' response function. We assume here that the two measuring apparatus are identical.

Moreover, in order to describe the experimental setting we must specify the relative angle $\Delta\Omega$ between the preferred directions of the two measuring apparatus and also the relative angle Φ along which the outcomes of the two apparatus would be fully anti-correlated. The latter angle can be identified with the phase that characterizes the quantum Bell state of the pair of particles,

$$|\Psi_\Phi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(|\uparrow\ \downarrow\rangle - e^{-i\Phi}\ |\downarrow\ \uparrow\rangle\right). \tag{1}$$

This angle can also be understood geometrically as a relative *twist* between *parallel* directions at the sites of particles A and B (see Fig. 2).

It is important to remark that it makes no sense to attempt to describe the experimental setting by specifying separately the angular orientations of each one of the measurement apparatus, since these orientations are not physical degrees of freedom and cannot be properly defined. Only the relative orientations $\Delta\Omega$ and Φ as defined above are physical degrees of freedom.

The additional implicit assumption mentioned above has to do with the transformation law that relates the two sets of coordinates, ω_A and ω'_B, that describe the orientation of the hidden configurations of the pair of particles with respect to the two measurement apparatus. We shall show below, see eq. (15-16), that in order to prove Bell's theorem and obtain Bell's inequalities it is necessary to assume that these two sets of coordinates are linearly related:

$$\omega'_B = -\omega_A + \Delta\Omega - \Phi. \tag{2}$$

Nevertheless, this linear relationship is not required by any fundamental physical principle. In particular, it is not required in order to comply with the trivial demand that a rotation of one of the measuring apparatus by an angle $\Delta\Omega$ followed by a second rotation by an angle $\Delta\Omega'$ must result into a final rotation by an angle $\Delta\Omega + \Delta\Omega'$. This demand is met as long as the two sets of coordinates are related by an strictly monotonic function that depends parametrically on the relative angle $\Delta \equiv \Delta\Omega - \Phi$,

$$\omega'_B = -L(\omega_A; \Delta\Omega - \Phi). \tag{3}$$

Consider, for example, an initial setting $\mathcal{T}_0$ in which the two measuring apparatus are aligned. In this setting the angular coordinates of the hidden configurations in the two measuring apparatus, w_A and w_B, would be related by the relationship:

$$\omega_B = -L(\omega_A; -\Phi). \tag{4}$$

We now define an intermediate measurement setting $\mathcal{T}_1$ obtained from the initial setting $\mathcal{T}_0$ by rotating the orientation of the apparatus by an angle $\Delta\Omega$. The angular coordinates ω_A and ω'_B defined with respect to this new setting would be related by:

$$\omega'_B = -L(\omega_A; \Delta\Omega - \Phi). \tag{5}$$

Finally, we define a final measurement setting $\mathcal{T}_2$ obtained from the intermediate setting $\mathcal{T}_1$ by rotating the orientation of the apparatus by an additional angle $\Delta\Omega'$. In the intermediate setting $\mathcal{T}_1$, which we have now taken as reference to define the second rotation, the pair of particles appears to be in a polarization state characterized by a phase $\Phi' = -\Delta\Omega + \Phi$. Hence, the angular coordinates w_A and w''_B defined with respect to the final setting would be related by the transformation law:

$$\omega''_B = -L(\omega_A; \Delta\Omega' - \Phi') = -L(\omega_A; \Delta\Omega' + \Delta\Omega - \Phi). \tag{6}$$

By comparison of the transformation law (4) for the initial setting $\mathcal{T}_0$ and the transformation law (6) for the final setting $\mathcal{T}_2$, we realize that the final setting has been obtained from the initial setting by rotating the apparatus by an angle $\Delta\Omega' + \Delta\Omega$, as we had demanded.

We shall show in this paper that by choosing the transformation law (3) as specified in equations (8),(9) below, we can explicitly build a model of hidden variables that accommodates together the principles of locality, physical realism and 'free will', and fully reproduces the predictions of quantum mechanics for Bell's states of two entangled particles.

The crux of the model that we present here lies on the fact that the hidden configuration of the pair of particles breaks the rotational gauge symmetry along an otherwise arbitrary direction. Hence, in order to obtain the statistical features of a long sequence of arbitrarily oriented hidden configurations we need to fix a gauge frame and describe all the different realizations in this same frame.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we develop in detail our model of hidden variables for Bell's states and discuss it at the light of one of the best known experimental setups for testing Bell's inequalities. In section 3 we explore the status of Bell's inequalities in the framework of this model. In section 4 we present some additional features of the model. We summarize our conclusions in section 5.

2. The quantum mechanical prediction for the statistical correlation between the outcomes of strong polarization measurements performed along any two arbitrary directions on a pair of entangled particles prepared in the quantum Bell state (1) is given by:

$$E(\Delta\Omega, \Phi) = -\cos\left(\Delta\Omega - \Phi\right). \tag{7}$$

We present here an explicit model of hidden variables that reproduces these correlations and complies with the requirements of locality, physical realism and 'free will'.

We consider a statistical system consisting of an infinitely large number of possible hidden configurations for the pair of entangled particles. Each configuration is characterized by its angular orientation in certain plane. This orientation is described with respect to the preferred directions of each one of the measurement apparatus. The corresponding angular coordinates, ω_A and ω'_B, are related by equation (3), with $L(\omega;\Delta)$ defined as follows (see Fig. 1):

- If $\Delta \in [0, \pi)$,

$$L(\omega;\Delta) = \begin{cases} q(\omega)\cdot \mathrm{acos}\left(-\cos(\Delta)-\cos(\omega)-1\right), \\ \qquad\qquad \text{if} \quad -\pi \quad \le \omega < \Delta - \pi, \\ q(\omega)\cdot \mathrm{acos}\left(+\cos(\Delta)+\cos(\omega)-1\right), \\ \qquad\qquad \text{if } \Delta-\pi \quad \le \omega < \quad 0, \\ q(\omega)\cdot \mathrm{acos}\left(+\cos(\Delta)-\cos(\omega)+1\right), \\ \qquad\qquad \text{if} \quad 0 \quad \le \omega < \ \Delta, \\ q(\omega)\cdot \mathrm{acos}\left(-\cos(\Delta)+\cos(\omega)+1\right), \\ \qquad\qquad \text{if} \quad \Delta \quad \le \omega < +\pi, \end{cases} \tag{8}$$

- If $\Delta \in [-\pi, 0)$,

$$L(\omega;\Delta) = \begin{cases} q(\omega)\cdot \mathrm{acos}\left(-\cos(\Delta)+\cos(\omega)+1\right), \\ \qquad\qquad \text{if} \quad -\pi \quad \le \omega < \Delta, \\ q(\omega)\cdot \mathrm{acos}\left(+\cos(\Delta)-\cos(\omega)+1\right), \\ \qquad\qquad \text{if} \quad \Delta \quad \le \omega < \ 0, \\ q(\omega)\cdot \mathrm{acos}\left(+\cos(\Delta)+\cos(\omega)-1\right), \\ \qquad\qquad \text{if} \quad 0 \quad \le \omega < \Delta + \pi, \\ q(\omega)\cdot \mathrm{acos}\left(-\cos(\Delta)-\cos(\omega)-1\right), \\ \qquad\qquad \text{if} \quad \Delta+\pi \le \omega < +\pi, \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

where

$$q(\omega) = \mathrm{sign}((\omega - \Delta)\mathrm{mod}([-\pi, \pi))),$$

and the function $y = \mathrm{acos}(x)$ is defined in its main branch, such that $y \in [0, \pi]$ while $x \in [-1, +1]$. The transformation laws (8), (9) define a commutative group of symmetry operations.

Furthermore, we define the probability to occur of each one of these possible hidden configurations as:

$$|\mathrm{d}\omega'_B \ g(\omega'_B)| = \frac{1}{4}|\mathrm{d}\omega'_B \ \sin(\omega'_B)| = \frac{1}{4}|\mathrm{d}(\cos(\omega'_B))| =$$
$$= \frac{1}{4}|\mathrm{d}(\cos(\omega_A))| = \frac{1}{4}|\mathrm{d}\omega_A \ \sin(\omega_A)| = |\mathrm{d}\omega_A \ g(\omega_A)|, \tag{10}$$

where

$$g\left(\omega\right) = \frac{1}{4}\left|\sin\left(\omega\right)\right| \tag{11}$$



FIG. 1. Plot of the transformation law $\omega \to \omega' = L(\omega;\Delta)$ for $\Delta = \pi/3$ (solid line), compared to the corresponding linear transformation (dotted line).

is the probability density distribution. Equation (10) implies, in particular, that this probability density distribution is functionally invariant under the transformation laws (8), (9), as required by symmetry considerations. In addition, equation (10) strictly states that the probability to occur of any of these hidden configurations is invariant under the coordinate transformation or, in other words, that the model complies with the 'free will' assumption.

We now define the outcome of a strong measurement of the polarization of particle A according to the sign of the angular coordinate ω_A of the hidden configuration in which the pair of particles happen to be found. That is,

$$S^{(A)}(\omega_A) = \begin{cases} +1, & \text{if} \quad \omega_A \in [\ 0, \ \pi), \\ -1, & \text{if} \quad \omega_A \in [\ -\pi, \ 0). \end{cases} \tag{12}$$

Hence, each one of the two possible outcomes happens with probability 1/2.

Similarly, the outcome of a strong measurement of the polarization of particle B is defined by the sign of the angular coordinate ω'_B of the hidden configuration of the pair of particles. That is,

$$S^{(B)}(\omega'_B) = \begin{cases} +1, & \text{if} \quad \omega'_B \in [\ 0, \ \pi), \\ -1, & \text{if} \quad \omega'_B \in [\ -\pi, \ 0). \end{cases} \tag{13}$$

Using the transformation laws (8), (9) it is straightforward to check that,

$$S^{(B)}(\omega_A) = \begin{cases} +1, \ \text{if } \omega_A \in & [\Delta - \pi, \Delta), \\ -1, \ \text{if } \omega_A \in & [-\pi, \Delta - \pi) \bigcup [\Delta, \pi), \end{cases} \tag{14}$$

where we have assumed, without any loss of generality, that $\Delta \in [0, \pi)$. Therefore, the four possible outcomes

of the two strong measurements define a partition of the phase space of all the possible hidden configurations of the pair of particles into four coarse subsets,

$$(S^{(A)}=+1;S^{(B)}=+1)\Longleftrightarrow\omega_A\in[0,\Delta)$$
$$(S^{(A)}=+1;S^{(B)}=-1)\Longleftrightarrow\omega_A\in[\Delta,\pi)$$
$$(S^{(A)}=-1;S^{(B)}=+1)\Longleftrightarrow\omega_A\in[\Delta-\pi,0)$$
$$(S^{(A)}=-1;S^{(B)}=-1)\Longleftrightarrow\omega_A\in[-\pi,\Delta-\pi),$$

whose probabilities to happen are:

$$p\left(+1,+1\right)=\int_0^{\Delta}g(\omega_A)\;d\omega_A\;\;=\;\frac{1}{4}\left(1-\cos(\Delta)\right),$$
$$p\left(+1,-1\right)=\int_{\Delta}^{\pi}g(\omega_A)\;d\omega_A\;\;=\;\frac{1}{4}\left(1+\cos(\Delta)\right),$$
$$p\left(-1,+1\right)=\int_{\Delta-\pi}^{0}g(\omega_A)\;d\omega_A\;=\;\frac{1}{4}\left(1+\cos(\Delta)\right),$$
$$p\left(-1,-1\right)=\int_{-\pi}^{\Delta-\pi}g(\omega_A)\;d\omega_A=\;\frac{1}{4}\left(1-\cos(\Delta)\right).$$

Hence, the statistical correlation $E(\Delta)\equiv\langle S^{(A)}\cdot S^{(B)}\rangle$ between the outcomes of the two polarization measurements is given by:

$$E(\Delta)=2\int_0^{\Delta}g(\omega_A)d\omega_A-2\int_{\Delta}^{\pi}g(\omega_A)d\omega_A$$
$$=4\int_0^{\Delta}g(\omega_A)\;d\omega_A-1=-\cos\left(\Delta\right),$$

which reproduces the predictions of quantum mechanics.

The model that we have presented here can also describe experimental tests of Bell inequalities in which electro-optical modulators located along the paths of the two entangled particles shift their polarizations by random angles α and β, *e.g.* the classical Weihs-Zeilinger experiment [17]. The modulators shift $\Phi\rightarrow\Phi-\Lambda$ the phase of the quantum state of the pair of particles by an angle $\Lambda=\alpha+\beta$. This could be understood in geometric terms as if the modulators would have twisted the angular space at the sites of particles A and B by angles α and β, respectively, so that two parallel directions would effectively be separated by an angle $\Delta\Omega=\alpha+\beta$ (see Fig. 2).

3. It is straightforward to notice that Bell's theorem does not hold for this model because of the non-linear transformation laws (8,9) that relate the angular coordinates of the hidden configurations of the pair of particles in the frames of reference of the two measurement apparatus.

Bell's theorem states that in generic local and realistic models of hidden variables for the singlet Bell state the inequality $|E(\Delta\Omega')-E(\Delta\Omega'')|\leq1+E(\Delta\Omega''-\Delta\Omega')$ holds for any two arbitrary relative angles $\Delta\Omega'$ and $\Delta\Omega''$.



FIG. 2. A geometrical interpretation of the Weihs-Zeilinger experimental setup, in which seemingly parallel directions are actually separated by an angle $\Lambda=\alpha+\beta$ due to a twist of the polarization space fabric caused by the electro-optical modulators.

On the other hand, in our model

$$|E(\Delta\Omega')-E(\Delta\Omega'')|=4\int_{\Delta\Omega'}^{\Delta\Omega''}d\omega_A\;g(\omega_A)=$$
$$=1+\left(4\int_{\Delta\Omega'}^{\Delta\Omega''}d\omega_A g(\omega_A)-1\right),\qquad(15)$$

where we have assumed without any loss of generality that $\pi\geq\Delta\Omega''\geq\Delta\Omega'\geq0$. We can now see that

$$4\int_{\Delta\Omega'}^{\Delta\Omega''}d\omega_A\;g(\omega_A)-1=$$
$$=4\int_0^{\mathrm{acos}(\cos(\Delta\Omega'')-\cos(\Delta\Omega')+1)}d\omega'_A\;g(\omega'_A)-1$$

is not necessarily smaller than

$$E(\Delta\Omega''-\Delta\Omega')=4\int_0^{\Delta\Omega''-\Delta\Omega'}d\omega'_A\;g(\omega'_A)-1,\quad(16)$$

and, therefore, Bell's inequality does not necessarily hold.

Obviously, neither alternative versions of Bell's theorem do hold for the model presented here. For example, the Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt (CHSH) theorem states that in generic local and realistic models of hidden variables for the singlet Bell state the inequality $2\geq|E(\Delta\Omega')+E(\Delta\Omega'')+E(\Delta\Omega'-\Delta\Omega)-E(\Delta\Omega''-\Delta\Omega)|$ holds for any three arbitrary relative angles $\Delta\Omega$, $\Delta\Omega'$ and $\Delta\Omega''$. In order to prove this statement it is noticed that the outcomes $s^{(A)}_{\Omega_0}(w),s^{(A)}_{\Theta_0}(w),s^{(B)}_{\Omega'_0}(w),s^{(B)}_{\Omega''_0}(w)=\pm1$ that any hidden configuration w would produce in polarization measurement apparatus oriented along four arbitrary directions, Ω_0 and Θ_0 for particle A and Ω'_0 and Ω''_0 for particle B, must fulfill the inequality:

$$\left|s^{(A)}_{\Omega_0}\cdot\left(s^{(B)}_{\Omega'_0}+s^{(B)}_{\Omega''_0}\right)+s^{(A)}_{\Theta_0}\cdot\left(s^{(B)}_{\Omega'_0}-s^{(B)}_{\Omega''_0}\right)\right|\leq2,\quad(17)$$

since either $\left|s^{(B)}_{\Omega'_0}+s^{(B)}_{\Omega''_0}\right|=0$ and $\left|s^{(B)}_{\Omega'_0}-s^{(B)}_{\Omega''_0}\right|=2$ or $\left|s^{(B)}_{\Omega'_0}+s^{(B)}_{\Omega''_0}\right|=2$ and $\left|s^{(B)}_{\Omega'_0}-s^{(B)}_{\Omega''_0}\right|=0$. The CHSH inequality is then obtained by averaging over the space

of all possible hidden configurations. However, this proof manifestly relies on the additional implicit assumption noted throughout this paper, namely, that there exists an absolute angular frame of reference with respect to which we can specify the orientation of the measurement apparatus of each one of the observers. In the absence of such an absolute angular frame of reference we could not define separately the orientation of each one of the devices: only their relative orientation would be a properly defined physical degree of freedom, while their global orientation would be an spurious gauge degree of freedom. Thus, any two measurement settings in which the two devices have the same relative orientation would be physically indistinguishable. In other words, without the mentioned additional implicit assumption it would make no sense to consider in the same statement two alternative orientations for the apparatus of observer A together with two alternative orientations for the apparatus of observer B. In order to obtain the average value of the random variable involved in the CHSH inequality $S^{(A)}_{\Omega_0}(\omega_A)\cdot\Big(S^{(B)}_{\Omega_0+\Delta\Omega'}(\omega'_B)+S^{(B)}_{\Omega_0+\Delta\Omega''}(\omega''_B)+S^{(B)}_{\Omega_0+\Delta\Omega'-\Delta\Omega}(\omega'''_B)-S^{(B)}_{\Omega_0+\Delta\Omega''-\Delta\Omega}(\omega''''_B)\Big)$ in a model in which the global orientation of the two measurement devices is a gauge degree of freedom, we must choose a common reference direction for the description of the polarization of, say, particle A (gauge-fixing condition) and, then four different relative orientations $\Delta\Omega'$, $\Delta\Omega''$, $\Delta\Omega''-\Delta\Omega$ and $\Delta\Omega'-\Delta\Omega$ for the measurement of the polarization of particle B. Otherwise, the average over the space of all possible configurations would not be properly defined. It is then evident that the random variable so defined does not necessarily take values in the interval $[-2,2]$ and, hence, these models do not necessarily comply with the CHSH inequality.

The same arguments remain true for the non-linear transformation laws $\omega'_B=-L_n(\omega,\Delta)$ for $n=1,2,3,...$, which preserve the probability density distributions of states

$$g_n(\omega)=\frac{1}{4}\left|\sin(n\,\omega)\right|. \tag{18}$$

In this paper we have singled out the particular case $n=1$ because it reproduces the predictions of quantum mechanics for Bell's entangled states of two particles. Nevertheless, it is interesting to notice that as $n\to\infty$ the corresponding transformation law approaches the usual linear transformation law (see Fig. 3), and the corresponding correlations approach Bell's constraints.

4. The model of hidden variables presented in the previous sections reproduces the average values and correlations predicted by quantum mechanics for long sequences of strong polarization measurements performed along any two arbitrary directions on pairs of particles prepared in a Bell's entangled state. Yet the model is not a complete description of the system in the terms envisioned by Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen [1]. Indeed, the preferred direction of each measurement apparatus defines a frame of reference and the model above describes the polarization properties of the pair of particles only along these reference directions. In order to have a complete description we need to define with respect to a given frame of reference the polarization properties of the particles along any other directions. That is, for each possible hidden configuration of the pair of particles we need to assign to each *element of reality* an specific value, which we shall call its hidden value. Obviously, this value may depend on the reference frame chosen by the observer to describe the system.

This is done in this section. We notice that weak measurements can test the polarization properties of the entangled particles along directions distinct from those chosen to strongly test the system and define the post-selection conditions [24, 25]. Thus, we derive the hidden values of the polarization components in our statistical model directly from their weak values in the standard formalism. Hence our definition of hidden values is explicitly local. However, in order to complete our program we are forced to relax the current working interpretation of the concept of physical realism. In particular, we allow for these hidden values to be complex numbers and do not constraint them to abide to the standard *classical* algebraic relationships.

For example, we define the polarization properties of particle A in the frame of an observer that chooses the direction Ω_A as reference, as follows:

$$s^{(A)}_{\Omega_A}(\omega_A)=+1,\ s^{(A)}_{\Omega^{\perp}_A}(\omega_A)=+i,\ s^{(A)}_{Z}(\omega_A)=-\tfrac{1}{\tan\omega_A},\quad \text{if}\ \ \omega_A\in[0,+\pi),$$

$$s^{(A)}_{\Omega_A}(\omega_A)=-1,\ s^{(A)}_{\Omega^{\perp}_A}(\omega_A)=-i,\ s^{(A)}_{Z}(\omega_A)=+\tfrac{1}{\tan\omega_A},\quad \text{if}\ \ \omega_A\in[-\pi,0),$$

where $s^{(A)}_{\Omega_A}$, $s^{(A)}_{\Omega^{\perp}_A}$ and $s^{(A)}_{Z}$ denote, respectively, its polarization components along the reference direction set by the observer, along its orthogonal right-oriented direction in the XY plane and along the particle's flight direction. Its polarization along any other direction is defined linearly with respect to them, *i.e.* $s^{(A)}_{\Omega'_A=\Omega_A+\Delta\Omega}(\omega_A)=\cos(\Delta\Omega)\cdot s^{(A)}_{\Omega_A}(\omega_A)+\sin(\Delta\Omega)\cdot s^{(A)}_{\Omega^{\perp}_A}(\omega_A)$.

We can now think about weak measurements as tests of the hidden values that we have just defined, followed by strong tests of the polarization properties of the particles along two arbitrary reference directions. It might be the case that these hidden polarization properties cannot be determined with high precision in a single weak measurement, so that in order to obtain a high precision

measurement of these properties we would need to repeat the weak measurement on many identically prepared systems. Thus, the price that we would need to pay to gain higher precision in determining these properties is that they could be measured only on average over each one of the four different coarse subsets of the hidden phase space defined by the outcomes $S^{(A)}_{\Omega_A} = \pm 1,\ S^{(B)}_{\Omega'_B} = \pm 1$ of the two strong measurements. It is now straightforward to test that the statistical averages of the hidden polarization values assigned above reproduce the quantum mechanical weak values of all physical observables for each of the four possible options for the post-selection conditions:

$$\frac{\int_0^{\Delta} d\omega_A\ g(\omega_A)\ s^{(A)}_{\Omega_A,\Omega^{\perp}_A,Z}(\omega_A)}{\int_0^{\Delta} d\omega_A\ g(\omega_A)} = \\ = \frac{< S^{(A)}_{\Omega_A} = +1; S^{(B)}_{\Omega'_B} = +1 | \sigma^{(A)}_{\Omega_A,\Omega^{\perp}_A,Z} | \Psi >}{< S^{(A)}_{\Omega_A} = +1; S^{(B)}_{\Omega'_B} = +1 | \Psi >},$$

$$\frac{\int_{\Delta}^{\pi} d\omega_A\ g(\omega_A)\ s^{(A)}_{\Omega_A,\Omega^{\perp}_A,Z}(\omega_A)}{\int_{\Delta}^{\pi} d\omega_A\ g(\omega_A)} = \\ = \frac{< S^{(A)}_{\Omega_A} = +1; S^{(B)}_{\Omega'_B} = -1 | \sigma^{(A)}_{\Omega_A,\Omega^{\perp}_A,Z} | \Psi >}{< S^{(A)}_{\Omega_A} = +1; S^{(B)}_{\Omega'_B} = -1 | \Psi >},$$

$$\frac{\int_{\Delta-\pi}^{0} d\omega_A\ g(\omega_A)\ s^{(A)}_{\Omega_A,\Omega^{\perp}_A,Z}(\omega_A)}{\int_{\Delta-\pi}^{0} d\omega_A\ g(\omega_A)} = \\ = \frac{< S^{(A)}_{\Omega_A} = -1; S^{(B)}_{\Omega'_B} = +1 | \sigma^{(A)}_{\Omega_A,\Omega^{\perp}_A,Z} | \Psi >}{< S^{(A)}_{\Omega_A} = -1; S^{(B)}_{\Omega'_B} = +1 | \Psi >},$$

$$\frac{\int_{-\pi}^{\Delta-\pi} d\omega_A\ g(\omega_A)\ s^{(A)}_{\Omega_A,\Omega^{\perp}_A,Z}(\omega_A)}{\int_{-\pi}^{\Delta-\pi} d\omega_A\ g(\omega_A)} = \\ = \frac{< S^{(A)}_{\Omega_A} = -1; S^{(B)}_{\Omega'_B} = -1 | \sigma^{(A)}_{\Omega_A,\Omega^{\perp}_A,Z} | \Psi >}{< S^{(A)}_{\Omega_A} = -1; S^{(B)}_{\Omega'_B} = -1 | \Psi >},$$

where $\sigma^{(A)}_{\Omega_A}$, $\sigma^{(A)}_{\Omega^{\perp}_A}$, $\sigma^{(A)}_Z$ are the quantum operators that represent the polarization components of particle A along the corresponding directions and we have assumed without any loss of generality that $\Delta \geq 0$.

Finally, we can define the dynamics of these hidden polarization properties when any of the particles interacts with the external world using the Heisenberg representation of the quantum operators, *i.e.*, $\sigma^{(A)}_{\Omega}(t) = e^{+iH_A t}\sigma^{(A)}_{\Omega}e^{-iH_A t}$, where H_A is the hamiltonian that describes the interaction. In other words, the hidden value of the physical observable $\sigma^{(A)}_{\Omega}$ at time t in each hidden state ω is given by the hidden value of the observable $\sigma^{(A)}_{\Omega}(t)$ as described above. This definition is explicitly local, as the polarization properties of particle B are not modified by the interactions of particle A with the external world and viceversa, as $\sigma^{(B)}(t) = e^{+iH_A t}\sigma^{(B)}e^{-iH_A t} = \sigma^{(B)}$.



FIG. 3. Plot of the transformation law $\omega \to \omega' = L_n(\omega;\Delta)$ with $n = 7$ (solid line) and $n = 1$ (dotted line), for $\Delta = \pi/3$. As $n \to \infty$ the transformation gets closer to be linear.

Furthermore, we can define the dynamics of the average values of these hidden polarization properties over each one of the four coarse subsets defined by the outcomes $(\pm 1, \pm 1)$ of the two strong measurements and obtain the pseudo-classical paths introduced in [26, 27]. These pseudo-classical paths may be a useful toll for performing numerical simulations of quantum systems, as

- Each one of the four paths happens with a well defined probability

$$p_{\pm,\pm} = | < S^{(A)}_{\Omega_A} = \pm 1; S^{(B)}_{\Omega'_B} = \pm 1 | \Psi > |^2, \qquad (19)$$

  so that, $\sum_{\pm,\pm} p_{\pm,\pm} = 1$.

- Along each of these paths every physical observable $\mathcal{O}(t) = e^{+iHt}\mathcal{O}e^{-iHt}$ is given its corresponding weak value [24, 25]:

$$O_w(t)(\pm,\pm) = \frac{< S^{(A)}_{\Omega_A} = \pm 1; S^{(B)}_{\Omega'_B} = \pm 1 | \mathcal{O}(t) | \Psi >}{< S^{(A)}_{\Omega_A} \pm 1; S^{(B)}_{\Omega'_B} = \pm 1 | \Psi >}, \qquad (20)$$

so that it is straightforward to show that this statistical model reproduces the quantum average values of all physical observables:

$$\sum_{\pm,\pm} p_{\pm,\pm} \cdot \mathcal{O}_w(t)(\pm,\pm) =< \Psi | \mathcal{O}(t) | \Psi >, \qquad (21)$$

as well as their statistical correlations:

$$\sum_{\pm,\pm} p_{\pm,\pm} \cdot (\mathcal{O}_1)_w(t_1)^*(\pm,\pm) \cdot (\mathcal{O}_2)_w(t_2)(\pm,\pm) = \\ =< \Psi|\mathcal{O}_1(t_1) \cdot \mathcal{O}_2(t_2)|\Psi >, \quad (22)$$

since

$$p_{\pm,\pm} \cdot \mathcal{O}_w(t)(\pm,\pm) = \\ = | < S = \pm 1; \pm 1|\Psi > |^2 \frac{< S = \pm 1; \pm 1|\mathcal{O}(t)|\Psi >}{< S = \pm 1; \pm 1|\Psi >} = \\ =< \Psi|S = \pm 1; \pm 1 >< S = \pm 1; \pm 1|\mathcal{O}(t)|\Psi >,$$

and

$$| < S = \pm 1; \pm 1|\Psi > |^2 \times \left(\frac{< S = \pm 1; \pm 1|\mathcal{O}_1(t_1)|\Psi >}{< S = \pm 1; \pm 1|\Psi >} \right)^* \\ \times \left(\frac{< S = \pm 1; \pm 1|\mathcal{O}_2(t_2)|\Psi >}{< S = \pm 1; \pm 1|\Psi >} \right) = \\ =< \Psi|\mathcal{O}_1(t_1)|S = \pm 1; \pm 1 >< S = \pm 1; \pm 1|\mathcal{O}_2(t_2)|\Psi > .$$

These pseudo-classical coarse paths may also help to understand the onset of *classical* dynamics in quantum systems.

5. We have presented in this paper a statistical model of hidden variables that fully reproduces the quantum mechanical predictions for Bell's states of two entangled particles. The model is local and realistic and, furthermore, it complies with the 'free will' requirements.

The key for reconciling the notions of locality, physical realism and 'free-will' with the predictions of quantum mechanics for Bell's polarization states is the observation that the transformation law that relates the angular orientations of the hidden configurations of the pair of particles with respect to the angular frames of reference defined by the two measuring apparatus does not have to be linear, if the rotational gauge symmetry is spontaneously broken.

Our model can complete the quantum mechanical description of Bell's states in the terms envisioned by Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen and, thus, it can solve the seventy years old EPR paradox. Nevertheless, in order to assign an specific value to each *element of reality* we found necessary to work out a less restrictive notion of physical realism and allow for these values to be complex numbers and not to abide to the rules of *classical* algebra. Obviously, these values may depend on the reference direction along which the observer chooses to describe the particle. Only the polarization component of each particle along the reference direction chosen to describe it must take a binary value, either $+1$ or -1, and abide to the rules of classical algebra.

The ideas presented here can be followed to build a statistical model of hidden variables for other quantum states and, in particular, for the Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger polarization state of three entangled particles and, thus, solve the 'superclassical' EPR paradox [28].

* d1306av@gmail.com

[1] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky and N. Rosen, Phys. Rev. **47**, 777-780 (1935).
[2] J.S. Bell, Physics **1**, 195-200 (1964).
[3] S. Kochen and E.P. Specker, J. Math. Mech. **17**, 59 (1967).
[4] J.F. Clauser, M.A. Horne, A. Shimony and R.A. Holt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **23**, 880884 (1969).
[5] J.F. Clauser and M.A. Horne, Phys. Rev. **D 10**, 526-535 (1974).
[6] D.M. Greenberger, M.A. Horne and A. Zeilinger, 'Bell's Theorem, Quantum Theory, and Conceptions of the Universe', Kluwer, Dordrecht (1989).
[7] A.J. Leggett, Found. Phys. **33**, 1469 (2003).
[8] R. Colbeck and R. Renner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 050403 (2008).
[9] A. Cabello, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 210401 (2008).
[10] A. Fine, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 291 (1982).
[11] M. Hall, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105** , 250404 (2010)
[12] A. Aspect, J.Dalibard and G. Roger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **49**, 1804 (1982).
[13] W. Tittel, J. Brendel, H. Zbinden and N.Gisin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 3563 (1998).
[14] G. Weihs et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 5039 (1998).
[15] D.N. Matsukevich et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 150404 (2008).
[16] M.A. Rowe et al., Nature **409**, 791 (2001).
[17] S. Groblacher et al., Nature **446**, 871 (2007).
[18] C. Branciard et al., Nature Phys. **4**, 681 (2008).
[19] E. Amselem, M. Radmark, M, Bourennane and A. Cabello, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 160405 (2009).
[20] G. Kirchmair et al., Nature **460**, 494 (2009).
[21] B. Hensen *et al*, Nature **526**, 682 (2015).
[22] H. Wiseman, Nature **526**, 649 (2015).
[23] A. Shapere and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **58**, 2051 (1987).
[24] Y. Aharonov, D. Albert and L. Vaidman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 1351 (1988).
[25] Y. Aharonov, D. Albert, A. Casher and L. Vaidman, Phys. Lett. **A124**, 199 (1987).
[26] R. Brustein and D.H. Oaknin, Phys. Rev. **D67** 025010 (2003).
[27] D.H. Oaknin, Phys. Rev. **D67** 105016 (2003).
[28] D.H. Oaknin, in preparation.